	DISTRICT COLUDT
WESTERN DISTRIC	DISTRICT COURT T OF WASHINGTON COMA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ex rel DAVID GOLDEN	CASE NO. C18-6051BHS
Plaintiff, v.	ORDER
TROY X. KELLEY, et al., Defendants.	
Vacate Judgment as per CR 60," Dkt. 36, "N	
Venue," Dkt. 38, and "Motion to Vacate," D motion.	kt. 39, which is in fact a Reply to his own
This matter was filed a as proposed qu	ui tam case in December 2018. Dkt. 1. The
United States Declined to Intervene, Dkt. 10	, and asked this Court ¹ to Dismiss the case,
This case was reassigned to the undersi Leighton's retirement from the federal bench. D	gned following the Honorable Ronald B. kt. 37.

Dkt. 13. The Court granted the motion and dismissed the case without prejudice, Dkt. 16, 1 2 and entered a judgment, Dkt. 18. 3 Undeterred, Golden filed subsequent motions to amend the judgment, Dkt. 21, to vacate the judgment, Dkt. 22, for sanctions, Dkt. 23, and a supplemental motion to 4 5 vacate, Dkt. 24. The Court denied the motions, Dkt. 25, and Golden appealed in July 6 2019, Dkt. 26. The Ninth Circuit affirmed the dismissal, finding that the "questions raised 7 in this appeal are so insubstantial as not to require further argument." Dkt. 31. On May 8 22, 2020, it denied Golden's Motion for Reconsideration. Dkt. 33. Golden's Petition for a 9 writ of mandamus or prohibition before the Supreme Court was rejected. *In re Golden*, 10 __ U.S. ____, 141 S. Ct. 464 (Mem) (2020). 11 Golden acknowledges that this case has long since been dismissed and closed and 12 that his appeals have been rejected, but explains that the Supreme Court erred, apparently 13 as part of a conspiracy against him: 14 The dismissal was appealed, but the U.S. Supreme Ct. refused to apply its own binding case law, and dismissed the appeal on 10/5/20, thereby denying Plaintiff restitution or even a hearing for contract fraud, so the 15 Defendants could corruptly launder more tax money. While on appeal, 16 Democrats and Republicans (ie., the Defendants) used the CIA and media to launch a Counterintelligence operation against Plaintiff (the CIA quid-17 pro-quo whistleblower impeachment hearings), which yielded no tangible results. 18 Dkt. 36 at 5. He asks this Court to vacate its own orders and award him the relief he 19 sought in his initial complaint, which, according to his civil cover sheet, is 20 \$1,000,000,000.00. Dkt. 1-1. 21 22

Golden's claims were and are facially frivolous, and his motions to resurrect this closed case are both untimely and unavailing. All are DENIED. This matter remains closed, and the Clerk is directed not to accept any further filings in it, other than a notice of appeal. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated this 8th day of September, 2021. United States District Judge